



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,714	01/05/2004	Wing K. Luk	YOR920030603US1	2257

48062 7590 03/09/2009
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
1300 POST ROAD
SUITE 205
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2009

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ADDENDUM TO NOTIFICATION OF DEFECTIVE APPEAL BRIEF

Ad item 4: The “Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter” fails to comply with requirement referred to in the instant Form PTO-462 ad (1) and as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37 (v), i.e., fails to provide

“A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters”.

In particular, with regard to claim 24:

(A) the first step, as recited in claim 24, i.e., “*determining that a voltage is to be amplified*” (claim 24, line 3) only is provided with a reference to a Drawing (Figure 13) and a reference to a numeral serving as reference character (1310) for the signal line, but NOT with the reference character for the voltage (Vi) NOR with a reference to the page and line(s) in the original specification where the step of determining said voltage is disclosed.

(B) The second step following said first step, i.e., lines 4-12 in the latest claim listing used for the Office action now being appealed, is not at all disclosed by the only portion of text in the specification (page 7, line 16 - page 8, line 9) provided in said Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter (see lines 15-25 on page 2 of the Appeal Brief): instead, said portion merely introduces structural components, primarily the gate diode, but does not even mention any step, e.g., the step “*modifying voltage on a control line*” nor does the cited portion disclose a “*control line*”, nor does said cited portion disclose a

Art Unit: 3663

“*signal line*”. Furthermore, in the aforementioned portion of the text as cited there is no reference to either Figure 13, nor to any of the structures referred to by reference characters.

(C) the third step following said second step, i.e., lines 13-19 (again referring to the most recent claim listing used for the action now being appealed), is not at all disclosed by the only portion of text in the specification (page 14, line 7 – page 15, line 7), nor does said portion of text refer to Figure 13 or any of the reference characters cited in the “Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter” discussing said second step, i.e., page 2, line 26 – page 3, line 4. Clearly, “Figure 11” by itself does not even exist, but *arguendo*, any of the Figures 11A, 11B and 11C structurally differ from Figure 13.

With regard to claim 25, i.e., the only other (dependent) claim appealed, the same defects in said Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter” are noted, especially the reference mismatch between Figures and reference characters on the one hand, and the cited portion of text from the original specification on the other hand.

Ad item 7: Appellant states that claims 24 and 25 are the claims that are being appealed (see “STATUS OF CLAIMS”, in the Appeal Brief, on page 2, line 6). In this light the Claims Appendix as defective, because said Claim appendix should contain only the texts of the claims involved in the appeal, i.e., claims 24 and 25, and not of all pending claims.

/Johannes P Mondt/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3663